



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,403	02/19/2004	Minoru Koyama	9319S-000674	4343
27572	7590	12/14/2005	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			GOLDBERG, BRIAN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2861	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/782,403

Applicant(s)

KOYAMA, MINORU

Examiner

Brian Goldberg

Art Unit

2861

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/19/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 5, line 7, "steam" should be "stream". On page 6, line 9, "if" should be "is".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 5 provides for the method of interfacing but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method, it is unclear what method applicant is intending to encompass.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Minowa (US 5543828).

5. Regarding claim 1, Minowa discloses “a data storage unit (11 and 12 of Fig 1), which respectively stores a first data block (11a of Fig 1) and a second data block (12a of Fig 1) following the first data block, for liquid drop discharge; and a data conversion unit (70 of Fig 1), which calculates a state transition data block based on the stored first and second data blocks; wherein: if the first data block is the same as the second data block, the data conversion unit outputs a state transition data block having a first value (col 6 ln 21-25); and if the first data block is different from the second data block, the data conversion unit outputs a state transition data block having a second value (col 6 ln 16-20).”

6. Regarding claim 2, Minowa discloses “the ink-jet head control circuit is provided in a driving device (60 of Fig 1).”

7. Regarding claim 3, Minowa discloses “the ink-jet head control circuit is provided in a computer connected to a driving device (col 7 ln 66 – col 8 ln 1).”

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miyajima et al. (US 6897887). Miyajima et al disclose “a data storage unit (32 of Fig 4), which stores a state transition block calculated based on first and second data blocks for liquid drop discharge (col 5 ln 21-27); and a data conversion unit (4 of Fig 4), which converts the stored state transition data block into a data block for liquid drop discharge; wherein: if the state transition data block has a first value, the data conversion unit determines that the first data block is the same as the second data block; and if the state transition data block has a second value, the data conversion unit determines that the first data block is different from the second data block (col 6 ln 20-55).”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minowa in view of Miyajima et al. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to make integral the ink-jet head control circuit of Minowa and the ink-jet head module of Miyajima et al. (see *In re Larson* 340 F.2d 965, 967, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965); *In re Wolfe* 251 F.2d 854, 855, 116 USPQ 443, 444 (CCPA 1958)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Goldberg whose telephone number is 571-272-2728. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Talbott can be reached on 571-272-1934. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2861

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BJG

December 5, 2005



Thinh Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800